Preparatory Committee for the 2020 Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons

Distr.: General
28 July 2017

Original: English

First session
2-12 May 2017

Summary record (partial)*of the 6th meeting
Held at the Vienna International Centre, Vienna, on Thursday, 4 May 2017, at 3 p.m.

Chair: Mr. van der Kwast ..... (Netherlands)

Contents

General debate on issues related to all aspects of the work of the Preparatory Committee (*continued*)

* No summary record was prepared for the rest of the meeting.

This record is subject to correction.

Corrections should be submitted in one of the working languages. They should be set forth in a memorandum and also incorporated in a copy of the record. They should be sent as soon as possible to the Chief of the Documents Management Section (dms@un.org).

Corrected records will be reissued electronically on the Official Document System of the United Nations (http://documents.un.org/).

17-07718 (E)

Please recycle

The meeting was called to order at 3.05 p.m.

General debate on issues related to all aspects of the work of the Preparatory Committee (*continued*)

1. **Mr. Abdalshafi** (Observer for the State of Palestine) said that that the State of Palestine was fully committed to the three pillars of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, namely nuclear non-proliferation, nuclear disarmament and the right to the peaceful uses of nuclear technology, and envisaged concluding an International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) safeguards agreement in order to follow up on the prerequisites to the Treaty. Nuclear and non-conventional arms were the most serious threat to the survival of humanity. The international community had made great progress in many regions of the world in terms of non-proliferation and the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones. However, it was deeply regrettable that the Middle East, which truly needed to become such a zone, was a long way from being declared so, since Israel was the sole State in the region that had not acceded to the Treaty, nor had it announced any intention to do so. Israel had also not placed its nuclear facilities under IAEA safeguards, and its nuclear programmes violated all nuclear security and human safety requirements.

2. His delegation called for the immediate elimination of nuclear arms from the Middle East in a comprehensive and non-selective manner. It was unacceptable that Israel had been making excuses to avoid being held responsible by the international community. Turning a blind eye to a State that had been proven to be acting in defiance of international law and that sought to develop and stockpile nuclear arms would not serve the goal of nuclear disarmament. On the contrary, it tarnished the credibility of the system which governed the relations of States. Establishing a Middle East zone free of nuclear weapons and all other weapons of mass destruction, as provided for in the resolution adopted at the 1995 Review and Extension Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, was a prerequisite for the attainment of peace and stability in the region. Accordingly, it was important to abide by the commitments contained in Final Document of the 1995 Review and Extension Conference, an imperative that had been reconfirmed at both the 2000 and 2010 Review Conferences. It was also important to continue the follow-on actions contained in the Final Document of the 2010 Review Conference, and to hold a conference on the establishment of a Middle East zone free of nuclear weapons and all other weapons of mass destruction prior to December 2018. The Secretary-General of the United Nations would play a preparatory and facilitator role in that process.

3. His delegation called on Israel to immediately accede to the Non-Proliferation Treaty and to place all of its nuclear programmes and facilities under IAEA safeguards. The risk of nuclear proliferation in the Middle East had been addressed in multiple Security Council and General Assembly resolutions. Specific steps needed to be taken, including appeals to the Security Council, to ensure that all States abided by international law. At the same time, it must be stressed that all States parties that complied with the Treaty, and all States operating under the system of IAEA safeguards, had the right to benefit from the peaceful uses of nuclear technology without any prior conditions being imposed on them.

4. The failures of the 2015 Review Conference should not be repeated and constructive steps must be taken to guarantee the success of the 2020 Review Conference.

5. **Mr. Quiñones** (Dominican Republic) said that his country was a nuclear-weapon-free State that supported efforts to counter the threat posed by nuclear weapons to humanity, peace and international security. As the cornerstone of the global nuclear non-proliferation and disarmament regime, the Non-Proliferation Treaty safeguarded the world from potential devastation by nuclear weapons. The three mutually reinforcing and interdependent pillars of the Treaty were vital tools used by the international community for the promotion of international peace and security.

6. As a founding member of IAEA, his country valued the Agency's efforts to verify that nuclear energy was being used for peaceful purposes by means of safeguards agreements, in addition to its promotion of global nuclear safety and security. For its part, the Dominican Republic had ratified the Amendment to the Convention on the Physical Protection of Nuclear Material, welcomed its entry into force and supported its universalization.

7. His delegation supported work that enabled countries to benefit from the peaceful uses of nuclear technology through the IAEA Technical Cooperation Programme. Nuclear technology played a significant role in the attainment of the Sustainable Development Goals, owing to the contribution that it could make in such areas as combating cancer, managing water and agricultural resources and producing energy. The international community should increase its support to

further expand the use of nuclear technology for peaceful purposes.

8. All States should recognize that strengthening the Non-Proliferation Treaty was a collective endeavour that must be underpinned by tangible measures. For example, the Dominican Republic had demonstrated its commitment to the pillars of the Treaty by concluding an IAEA safeguards agreement and accepting an additional protocol thereto. It urged those States that had not yet done so to follow suit and would continue to support initiatives for the promotion of non-proliferation and nuclear disarmament.

9. The joint comprehensive plan of action concerning the nuclear programme of Iran was welcome, as was the important role of IAEA in its implementation.

10. His country belonged to a region that had an impeccable history of nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation, which was reflected in the Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America and the Caribbean (Treaty of Tlatelolco). The establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones was a positive step towards worldwide disarmament.

11. To facilitate the prompt entry into force of the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty, the Annex 2 States that had not yet done so should accede to that important international instrument.

12. Lastly, as peace, security and development were intrinsically linked, States parties to the Non-Proliferation Treaty should demonstrate the necessary political will and flexibility to ensure that the 2020 Review Conference produced a successful outcome.

13. **Mr. Vu** (Viet Nam) said that the foreign policy of his country was one of independence, peace, cooperation and development, and that its objectives were in line with the Charter of the United Nations and international law. Viet Nam was fully committed to its obligations under the Treaty and had made contributions to efforts for peace, friendship and cooperation in Southeast Asia. The three pillars of the Non-Proliferation Treaty should be treated in a balanced, comprehensive and non-discriminatory manner.

14. His country urged all nuclear-weapon States to commit to concrete, verifiable and time-bound steps to reduce their nuclear stockpiles; to immediately pledge to cease the qualitative improvement, development, production and stockpiling of nuclear warheads and their delivery systems; to declare a moratorium on nuclear testing; to de-alert the operational status of their nuclear-weapon systems; to adopt a 'no first use" policy, and to provide legally binding negative security assurances to all non-nuclear-weapon States. In that regard, a universal, unconditional and legally binding instrument should be negotiated to provide non-nuclear-weapon States with security assurances against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons.

15. Nuclear-weapon-free zones were an important measure to strengthen nuclear non-proliferation and nuclear disarmament. His delegation therefore also urged the nuclear-weapon States to consider signing the Protocol to the Treaty on the Southeast Asia Nuclear Weapon-Free Zone (Treaty of Bangkok) and supported the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East, in accordance with the relevant General Assembly and Security Council resolutions.

16. Viet Nam supported efforts to promote nuclear safety and security and also attached great importance to the expansion of assistance to developing countries in the use of nuclear energy. Through its interactions and leadership responsibilities in the context of IAEA activities, Viet Nam had demonstrated its consistent policy of promoting the safe, secure and peaceful use of nuclear energy.

17. As a non-nuclear-weapon State, Viet Nam was deeply concerned by the catastrophic humanitarian consequences of nuclear weapons. In that regard, it had voted in favour of General Assembly resolution 71/258 to take forward multilateral nuclear disarmament negotiations on a legally binding instrument to prohibit nuclear weapons, leading to their total elimination.

18. **Mr. de Macedo Soares** (Secretary-General, Agency for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America and the Caribbean (OPANAL)) said that his Agency had been a regular participant in Preparatory Committee meetings, for which it had provided background documentation and position statements expressing the views of the States members of the Agency. Unfortunately there were no clear benchmarks for the most recent review cycle, since the 2015 Review Conference had failed to produce an outcome document. The impasse on that occasion related to the issue of the establishment of a Middle East zone free of nuclear weapons, thus demonstrating the continued relevance of that question not only for the Middle East, but also for the Korean Peninsula and other regions.

19. It was undisputed that one of the criteria for establishing nuclear-weapon-free zones was that they should emerge from arrangements freely arrived at by the States of the region concerned. However, that did not mean that a decision on the creation of such a zone

should be taken in camera and restricted to only those States. For instance, extra-regional States had been identified in the action plan contained in the Final Document of the 2010 Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons with regard to the establishment of a Middle East zone free of nuclear weapons and all other weapons of mass destruction. Many extra-regional States had also participated as observers during the negotiations of the Treaty of Tlatelolco in 1967.

20. The absence of a final document from the 2015 Review Conference had been preceded by a similar situation in the context of the Third Conference of States Parties and Signatories to Treaties that Establish Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zones and Mongolia, which raised the concern that the process of contact and collaboration had stalled. The latter series of Conferences was not a vague ritual of political affirmation, but a means of strengthening the exchange of views and information among the nuclear-weapon-free zones. The establishment and expansion of those zones around the world had been one of the foundations of the non-proliferation concept and one of the most successful steps towards the elimination of nuclear weapons.

21. On 14 February 2017, the States members of OPANAL had adopted a declaration on the fiftieth anniversary of the conclusion of the Treaty of Tlatelolco, as contained in a document submitted to the current session of the Preparatory Committee (NPT/CONF.2020/PC.I/2). The text of that declaration, which had been carefully worded and well thought out, elaborated the positions that would be sustained by Latin American and Caribbean countries throughout the current review cycle.

The discussion covered in the summary record ended at 3.40 p.m.